

REMARKS

In the application claims 45-52 and 56-62 remain pending while claims 1-44 and 53-55 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 53-55 have been canceled as being drawn to non-elected claim group II. Claims 56-62, which have been added by amendment and which find support in the application as filed (*See, e.g., Fig. 3*), are drawn to claim group I which claim group has been elected without traverse for prosecution on the merits.

The pending claims currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being rendered obvious primarily by Duarte (U.S. Patent No. 6,608,271) in view of Weber (U.S. Patent No. 6,803,874).

The reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Considering Duarte, it is respectfully submitted that Duarte discloses a system that causes the function labels provided to each keys of a keyboard to be changed depending upon a position of a selector unit. (*See, e.g., Figs. 7 and 7A*). Thus, while Duarte discloses a system that selects *one color* among different colors to thereby illuminate *every key* of a device to thereby cause a current function of every key of the device that results from an operation of the selector unit to be indicated to a user, it is respectfully submitted that Duarte fails to disclose, teach, or suggest concurrently providing a different color to at least two groups of function keys of a controlling device and, more particularly, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest concurrently providing a different color to at least two groups of function keys of a controlling device wherein the different colors are used to indicate to a user different intended target devices for transmissions that are to be issued from the controlling device in response to activation of each key within a group of function keys as set forth in claim 45. Because Weber also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest these claimed elements - with Weber merely disclosing an otherwise conventional remote control, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Duarte and Weber cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with

respect to claim 45. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 45-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 must be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 56, it is again respectfully noted that Duarte discloses a system wherein a change in a selector unit causes *the labels of function keys* to be changed to thereby indicate to the user *which one of different functions* will be performed by the same intended target device, e.g., a PC, in response to an activation of the same function key. As will be appreciated, this stands in direct contrast to the invention set forth in claim 56 which sets forth a method wherein a different color, each representative of a different, intended target device, is provided to a group of function keys (which function keys will continue to cause *the same functions* to be performed by the different, intended target devices) while a label that indicates the function that is to be performed by the different, intended target devices in response to an activation of a function key within the group of function keys remains constant (because the same function is to be commanded in response to activation of a function key, albeit by two different devices depending upon the current device mode selected). Thus, because Duarte does not disclose, teach, or suggest the elements set forth in claim 56 (and because Weber also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest these claimed elements - with Weber merely disclosing an otherwise conventional remote control), it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Duarte and Weber cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 56. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 56-62 are also allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in good and proper form for allowance.

Such action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Should it be determined, however, that a telephone conference would expedite the

prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the attorney undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted;



Date: August 3, 2010

By: Gary R. Jarosik, Reg. No. 35,906
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 456-8449

CHI 59,596,212v1